DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 507 TE 000 947

By- Gritzbaugh, Stanley

An Objective Survey Report of English in the Junior High Schools of Illinois.

Pub Date Nov 65

Note- 28p.

Journal Cit- Illinois English Bulletin; v53 n2 p1-28 Nov 1965

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.50

Descriptors- *Curriculum Development, *Departmental Teaching Plans, Department Directors (School), *English Instruction, Instructional Program Divisions, *Junior High Schools, *School Organization, Secondary School Teachers, Teacher Background, Teaching Assignment, Teaching Load

The Special Projects Committee of the Illinois Association of Teachers of English undertook a survey of the 345 junior high school English Departments in the state to determine their organization and work. Questionnaires were sent to each department chairman. Responses from 166 schools yielded information about (1) grades included in the junior high school, (2) degree of organization of the English Department, (3) curriculum development, (4) teacher preparation and teaching assignments, and (5) the English teacher's load. It was concluded that many of the needed improvements in procedures and course content can be solved by the individual classroom teacher in cooperation with other members of the English department and school administrators. (SW)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ILLINOIS ENGLISH BULLETIN

Official Publication of the Illinois Association of Teachers of English

VOL. 53, No. 2 URBANA, ILLINOIS NOVEMBER, 1965

Published every month except June, July, August, and September. Subscription price, $2.00 per year; single copies, 35 cents. *Entered as second-class matter October 29, 1941, at the post office at Urbana, Illinois, under the act of March 3,1879.* Address all business communications to IATE Treasurer, 100 English Building, Urbana, Illinois. Address manuscripts and other editorial communications to Wilmer A. Lamar, Editor, 100 English Building, Urbana, Illinois; or to Joan Davis, Co-Editor, Champaign Senior High School, Champaign, Illinois. Member of NCTE Information Agreement.

An Objective Survey Report of English in the Junior High Schools of Illinois

ED025507

BY STANLEY GRITZBAUGH
Chairman of the IATE Junior High School Special Project Committee and Head of the English Department
Lincoln Junior High School
Rockford, Illinois

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction—History and Acknowledgments	3
Questionnaire Response	4
What Constitutes a Junior High School?	6
English Department Organization	7
Curriculum Development	10
Teaching Preparation and Assignments	17
English Teacher Load	20
A Challenge—Follow-up	26

TE 000 947

This excellent BULLETIN *represents a tremendous amount of work on the part of the IATE Junior High School Special Project Committee, and especially on the part of Stanley Gritzbaugh. Please call this study to the attention of school administrators and to your friends in junior high schools.*

LIST OF TABLES

Page

TABLE 1—Grades Included in Junior High Schools 6
TABLE 2—Department Organization 7
TABLE 3—Department Organization According to Number of Teachers Per School 8
TABLE 4—Department Leader Compensation 9
TABLE 5—Dates of Latest Curriculum Revisions 10
TABLE 6—Curriculum Development 11
TABLE 7—Teacher's Voice in Curriculum Building 11
TABLE 8—Sequential Development 11
TABLE 9—Curriculum—For What Grades Designed? 12
TABLE 10—Are Courses of Study Detailed? 12
TABLE 11—Amount of Instruction Time Devoted to Grammar, Composition, Literature, Reading and Spelling 13
TABLE 12—Year Formal Grammar Instruction Begins 14
TABLE 13—Approach to Grammar 15
TABLE 14—Ability Grouping 16
TABLE 15—Availability of Courses of Study 17
TABLE 16—Freedom of Teachers in Carrying Out Courses of Study 17
TABLE 17—Full and Part-Time English Instruction 18
TABLE 18—Other Subjects Taught by English Teachers 18
TABLE 19—Taught in a Block of Time with English 18
TABLE 20—English Teacher Preparation and Teaching Assignments 19
TABLE 21—Number of Full-Time English Teachers According to Staff Size 19
TABLE 22—Number of Classes Taught Per Day 21
TABLE 23—Number of Students Taught Each Day 21
TABLE 24—Length of Class Periods 22
TABLE 25—Number of Class Periods Per Week 23
TABLE 26—Full-Time Remedial Reading Teacher 24
TABLE 27—Special Duties—No Compensation 25

ED025507

INTRODUCTION

(History and Acknowledgments)

In the summer of 1963 Miss Emma Mae Leonhard, Special Projects chairman of the Illinois Association of Teachers of English, appointed a chairman of junior high school research. She did so in response to an expression of a strongly felt need for a survey which would reveal the facts concerning the organization and functioning of the 345 junior high school English departments throughout the state.

Prior to the 1963 fall IATE Conference, membership of the Junior High School Special Projects Committee was completed with the appointment of:

Mr. Sam Lucchese, Old Orchard Junior High School, Skokie
Mrs. Lorraine Morton, Language Arts Chairman, Nichols Junior High School, and Chairman of Language Arts, Evanston Junior High Schools
Mrs. Dorothea Trump, Washington Junior High School, Naperville
Katherine Wagenseller, Department Chairman, Centennial Junior High School, Decatur

In the initial meeting of the committee it was decided to conduct a survey in which questionnaires submitted to the English department chairmen of Illinois junior high schools would constitute the chief method of inquiry. Committee members were given "home assignments" calling for the construction of questionnaires.

The original thinking of the committee favored an inquiry into both *what* is being taught in the areas of grammar, composition, literature, reading, and spelling and vocabulary; and *how* each is being taught. Early in the course of the determination of the content of the survey form it was discovered that including the *how* would result in a lengthy questionnaire that would, in many cases, discourage response and call for highly subjective information that would be difficult to express in short summary form and to tabulate.

During the interchange of ideas that followed, committee members agreed that certain guiding principles should govern the formulation of questions to be included. It was reasoned that in the interest of brevity, ease of tabulation, and a high degree of validity, the survey form should be (1) as short as possible, (2) so phrased that any reasonably well-informed English teacher would be able to answer it, (3) objective rather than subjective, and (4) devoid of detailed information regarding teaching methods and course content.

Following completion of the first draft of the survey form, the committee deemed it desirable to submit the form to several consultants for suggestions. The committee is, therefore, deeply indebted to the following people for their very helpful advice and comments: Miss Emma Mae Leonhard, IATE Special Projects Chairman, and Chairman, retired, of the English department of Jacksonville High School; Dr. Woodson W. Fishback, Director of the Illinois Curriculum Program of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction; and Dr. William H. Evans, Assistant Professor of English Education at the University of Illinois.

Special credit is due one member of the committee, Mrs. Lorraine Morton, Language Arts Chairman of Evanston's Nichols Junior High School and of Evanston Junior High Schools. Serving in the capacity of chairman's assistant, Mrs. Morton contributed many valuable ideas in planning conferences that preceded final committee action.

The Special Projects Committee wishes to emphasize that in presenting this research summary to the IATE membership it does so not as a final word, but rather as an initial step in the process of assessment, comparison, and improvement of English courses and English instruction in the junior high schools of Illinois. Just as follow-up is the all-important factor in composition work in the classroom, so is it also with respect to the many problems that confront the English departments of the junior high schools throughout the state. Suggestions for implementing this report are contained in a special section following the survey summary.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE

Response to research conducted by questionnaires is always subject to varying interpretations. In the present instance placing undue emphasis upon mere numbers might well lead to the conclusion that a return of 166 of the 345 forms submitted for a percentage of 48.12 is not too satisfactory. One educator outside the committee, when asked for an expression of opinion on this point, declared bluntly that any return falling short of 75 percent on a research questionnaire directed to professional people is inexcusable.

Committee members do not share this view. Rather, they support the more optimistic view that is obtained when the following facts are considered:

1. No follow-up reminders were sent to schools not responding.

2. The returns, tabulated according to the six regional supervisory districts designated by the Department of Public Instruction, show surprisingly uniform responses throughout the state. (See Coverage and Response chart below)

3. There was excellent representation from schools having from one to twenty-four English teachers.

4. Twenty schools in the larger systems that are only partiallly represented speak for one or more other schools in the same systems.

As suggested previously, the districts listed on the Survey Coverage and Response chart below correspond with the regions that the office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction uses for supervisory purposes. It is interesting to note that percentagewise the leading district in terms of response, the North-West with 56.86 per cent, is followed closely by the South-West with 52.77 per cent. The other districts, in descending order, are the North-East, 49.56 per cent; the East-Central, 47.45 per cent; the West-Central, 41.37 per cent; and the South-East, 35.70 per cent.

SURVEY COVERAGE AND RESPONSE

Districts	No. of Schools	No. of Replies	Percentages
North-East	113	56	49.56
North-West	51	29	56.86
Total	164	85	50.60
East-Central	59	28	47.45
West-Central	58	24	41.37
Total	117	52	43.58
South-East	28	10	35.70
South-West	36	19	52.77
Total	64	29	42.60
Grand Totals	345	166	48.12

More important, perhaps, than the number of returns is the care exercised in supplying the information sought. Many were the questionnaires that evidenced professional enthusiasm by submitting, in addition to all the information asked for, detailed materials lists, explanatory notations, and personal messages. In fairness, however, it must be added that in a number of cases

forms were only partially completed. Most gratifying of all responses were those given in answer to the survey's two final questions. To the question, "Would you be willing to spell out in greater detail your answers to certain questions answered above if the need arises?" 135 of the 146 respondents answered in the affirmative. The response to the last question "Would you like to see the Special Projects Committee undertake further research?" was an even greater affirmative, 138 to 4.

It is the hope of the Junior High School Special Projects Committee and its sponsoring IATE organization that the most important response is yet to come in the form of action leading to the solution of the many problems experienced by English teachers everywhere. The committee would welcome reactions relating to the findings set forth in this report, together with suggestions as to how the state association can be of greater service to the junior high schools. Letters may be directed to the chairman, Stanley Gritzbaugh, 2407 Burton Street, Rockford, Illinois.

WHAT CONSTITUTES A JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL?

Little did the committee realize that, of the 36 direct questions asked on the English survey form, the one that held the greatest potential was the opening question, "What grades are included in your junior high school?" Replies reveal that among the 166 schools responding, there were four principal variations of grade combinations classified as junior high schools, the seventh and eighth being the most common.

TABLE 1

Grades Included

5–6–7–8	6–7–8	7–8	7–8–9
2	20	105	39

Although the above findings are contrary to the traditional seventh, eighth, and ninth grade junior high school concept, they are in marked contrast to the ten variations of grade combinations that were classified as junior high schools in the 1959–1960 *Directory of Illinois Schools.* Thus they appear to indicate a trend toward greater uniformity in junior high school organization. This should be good news to the authors of Illinois Curriculum Program Bulletin A-1, *The Junior High School in Illinois,* who expressed the hope that steps would be taken by the junior high schools to establish a more definite position between the elementary school on the one hand and the senior high school on the other.

A letter of inquiry directed to the Office of Public Instruction revealed that with respect to the creation of junior high schools the policy of the department has been a permissive one. Local districts alone determine whether or not their organizations include junior high schools. Superintendents, with the approval of their boards, have had it in their power to refer to a variety of upper grades as junior high schools. Because of the lack of standards to which it must conform, it would be possible for a newly created junior high school to lean heavily in either of two directions—toward elementary school organization or senior high school organization.

Schools could well differ in several important respects that would materially affect the status of English in particular: (1) teacher preparation, (2) degree of departmentalization, (3) length of class periods, and (4) content of individual courses of study. A careful study of the 26 reporting schools having either 5–8 or 6–8 organization fails to reveal serious weaknesses in these respects. In comparison percentage-wise with schools having 7–8 and 7–9 organization, the latter have more English majors, a greater degree of departmentalization, equally long (40–50 minute) class periods, and comparable course of study content.

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT ORGANIZATION

One of the characteristics that distinguishes the junior high school from the elementary school is that of departmentalization. The natural assumption is that most, if not all, junior high schools have a definite department organization. Survey figures reveal that such is not the case. Schools range from those having no acknowledged organization at all to those having full department organization with department leaders who are known by the titles of department heads or department chairmen. An indication as to which title is the more frequently used was made possible through a title check which was a part of the identification portion of the survey form. Twenty-eight respondents designated themselves as department chairmen, while 25 checked the title department head. Table 2 below presents analysis of the responses of the 166

TABLE 2
Department Organization

	Yes	No	No Response
Definite Organization	82	77	7
Dept. Head or Chairman	73	90	3

schools concerning department organization and department leadership.

A more detailed analysis of the situation in individual schools reveals the facts that in seventeen cases there is a definite department organization but no designated department leader, whereas in ten instances there is a department leader without a definite department organization.

No attempt was made in the survey to determine the factors that dictate a full or partial department organization. As one searches for an explanation, it seems logical to assume that the key to the answer undoubtedly lies in the related areas of school enrollment and the number of teachers in a department. However, figures belie this supposition. As Table 3 below suggests, schools with the smallest department memberships lay claim to a high percentage of department organization and department leadership.

TABLE 3

Department Organization According to the Number of Teachers Per School

	1–4	5–8	9–12	13–15	22–24
Definite Dept. Organization	22	28	23	6	3
Dept. Head or Dept. Chairman	12	24	28	6	3

Figures concerning department organization and department leadership do not tell the whole story. Personal comments made by individual teachers during the course of questionnaire distribution at the 1964 IATE Fall Conference, and on the forms as well, reveal that in numerous instances teachers are expected to do the administrative work of the department as a group without benefit of a chairman or formal department organization. This situation involves duties ranging from routine matters such as book distribution and record work to problems of curriculum planning that require weeks of study. In most cases such duties are performed as a "labor of love" without benefit of released time. Leadership, if any, in such cases is bestowed on the basis of seniority, or it revolves yearly from teacher to teacher. In either case the only compensation is that of the honorary title "Department Chairman."

A few such chairmen suggested on their survey forms that they are department heads "of a sort," "in name only," "unofficially," and "technically because of seniority." In one case a respondent reported that the purpose of the chairmanship was that of acting as a "liaison between the principal and the department." Although only one form stated outright that the principal serves as the

department leader, the fact that eighteen questionnaires were filled out by principals suggests that such a practice is not uncommon.

Frequently fully responsible department leaders do not fare much better than "name only" appointees in terms of time and money compensation. The prestige connected with their titles is a major portion of their reward for extra duties. Fifteen of the 73 heads or chairmen were listed as having the following time allowances: a home room period—3; a study hall instead of a class—2; one period—4; 2 periods—2; 3 periods—2; 60%—1; and in the case of a district leader—full time. Of the 26 who are given additional pay, 5 receive $100; 1—$120; 2—$125; 2—$150; 4—$200; 1—$300; 1—$375; 5—$500; and 1—$700. Four schools allowed both time and money differentials. One school that paid a differential of $100 last year discontinued it this year for reasons of economy.

TABLE 4
Department Leader Compensation

	Yes	No	No Response
Released Time	15	54	4
Pay Differential	26	43	4

The question might well be asked, "How much is an English department chairmanship worth?" The answer, of course, would require a comparison of the duties of a regular department member with those of the chairman. Unfortunately the survey questions did not call for a listing of the extra duties of a department leader. If they had, the duties would have varied from school to school, depending upon such factors as enrollment, number of English teachers, willingness of the principal to delegate responsibilities, and the existence of a salary schedule recognizing the principle of additional pay for added duties—in English as well as in athletics and other taken-for-granted areas.

Even before and certainly since Dusel's California study of the English teacher's load, it has been recommended that *every* teacher of English is entitled to *some relief*—fewer students per class or even fewer classes. How much more convincing is the case of the department leader who, in addition to carrying a full teaching load, is held responsible for such representative time and energy consuming supervisory tasks as budget making, assistance in hiring, class visitation, planning of courses and department tests, book distribution, attendance at special committee meetings, and annual reports.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

There are strong indications that English departments throughout the state are constantly striving to improve instruction by keeping pace with the national trend calling for continuous appraisal of the English curriculum in the light of the findings of research. For example, the dates of last revisions reported on the survey show a marked increase from the year 1955 to the present. Several schools reported that a system akin to a perpetual inventory existed, with constant revisions being made to keep the courses of study up-dated. The total picture, however, was somewhat clouded by the fact that slightly more than 35 per cent of the schools answering the questionnaire failed to indicate the date of last revision.

TABLE 5

Dates of Latest Curriculum Revisions

	Unknown	'55	'57	'58	'59	'60	'61	'62	'63	'64	In Progress	No Response
Number	2	1	1	1	6	9	9	14	24	30	10	59

Curriculum development programs carried on by the local system as a cooperating unit are more numerous than are those confined to individual schools within the system. Five schools indicated that they expedite curriculum improvement by employing supervisors of curriculum, curriculum coordinators, or curriculum superintendents. Others rely principally on committees that operate horizontally at the individual levels of the elementary, junior, and senior high schools or vertically on a city-wide basis.

An insight into the explanation for the lack of response on the part of so many schools is contained in the comments attached to several questionnaires. Three schools that participated in the survey, and some twenty that did not, employ a new type of curriculum developed by the English staff at University High School, the laboratory school of the College of Education at the University of Illinois. The curriculum is written for the academically talented, but is adaptable at all levels. Typical quotes from a few other survey forms provide further explanations: "not a curriculum as such"; "text-book curriculum"; "no set unit for curriculum except unified English texts"; "I develop it as I see fit"; "We usually follow the text."

TABLE 6
Curriculum Development

	School	System	Neither	No Response
Who develops it?	50	70	14	32

In the process of curriculum formulation and revision it is gratifying to note that the individual classroom teacher is allowed a strong voice in decision making. Almost two-thirds of the responses testify to this fact, as is shown by the table below.

TABLE 7
Teacher's Voice in Curriculum Building

Much	Some	Little	No Response
104	25	5	32

One of the demands made upon the modern day English curriculum is that which calls for the sequential development of teaching materials in order to ensure an orderly progression of learning concepts based upon the ability of students to comprehend and to apply the subject matter taught. Lack of a sequential program frequently results in the deadening repetition of subject matter from year to year, especially in such areas as grammar and composition. Survey responses of 68 per cent of the participating junior high schools suggest a curriculum providing for sequential development. Several that were in doubt as to whether or not their program of studies could be so classified entered a question mark to express their uncertainty. Others, which are listed along with the affirmative replies below, suggest that with the completion of present planning programs, development "will be sequential."

TABLE 8
Sequential Development

Uncertain	Yes	No	Partly	No Response
5	106	32	4	19

The extent to which a school system's curriculum is sequential is reflected in the grade range of its teaching program. Tabulation of the grades for which the English curriculum in the 120 reporting schools is designed reveals four distinct types: (1) one that is exclusively junior high school, (2) another that embraces all or a

part of the elementary school plus the junior high school, (3) a third that includes both the junior and senior high school, and (4) a fourth that contains all three units. The most common is the elementary-junior high school unit reported by 43 schools. This is followed by the junior high school unit itself (31) and the elementary, junior and senior high school combination (31). It is somewhat surprising to learn that the junior-senior high school course ranks last with 15.

TABLE 9

Curriculum—For What Grades Designed?

	K–8	1–8	1–9	2–8	3–8	Totals
Elementary-Junior High	3	27	9	2	2	43
	7–8	7–9	6–8	6–9		
Junior High Alone	8	18	4	1		31
	K–12	1–12				
Elementary-Junior-Senior	1	30				31
	7–11	7–12				
Junior-Senior High	3	12				15

The desired result of curriculum planning is a series of courses of study that are spelled out in great enough detail to serve as teaching guides that will assure adequate development of recommended materials at all grade levels. Survey results suggest that in 73 percent of the schools reporting, courses of study in the area of grammar most frequently lend themselves to a detailed enumeration of content. Spelling, literature, composition, and reading follow in that order, each being slightly above or slightly below the 50 percent mark.

TABLE 10

Are Courses of Study Detailed?

	Grammar	Literature	Spelling	Reading	Composition
Yes	122	86	92	81	81

The amount of detail that a course of study devotes to each of the five areas of English instruction is, of course, directly related to the relative importance ascribed to each area both by the department as a whole and by the individual teacher. Many

a course of study has lacked balance because of undue emphasis on one or more areas. In recent years the charge most often heard has been that grammar and literature have been given the most-favored treatment at the expense of composition.

To determine what the situation is in the junior high schools of Illinois, the survey committee decided to ask for an expression of opinion on the matter. The instruction given on the survey form read, "Use the numbers 1 (greatest) through 5 (least) to indicate the amount of instruction time devoted to classwork in the areas listed" (composition, literature, grammar, reading and spelling).

Most, but not all respondents, gave a straight one to five answer. A few reasoned that, since all five areas are treated alike, all should be rated one. Other combinations, such as 2-2-3-3-1 and 1-4-2-2-3, suggest a varying emphasis. Comments added suggested that the time devoted to each area varies among teachers, classes, and differing ability groups.

After a tabulation of the returns shown in Table 11, it was felt that determining comparative number totals would make the rating more meaningful. These totals, which are found in the last column of the table, were arrived at by crediting five points for a first place, four for a second, and on down to one for a fifth. The final result shows grammar receiving considerably more instruction time than that given any other area. Composition is in second place ahead of third place literature, and reading and spelling are not far behind in fourth and fifth places, respectively.

TABLE 11

Amount of Instruction Time Devoted to:

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	Comparative Number Totals
Grammar	88	29	15	5	9	605
Composition	29	39	35	23	17	469
Literature	30	37	26	25	17	443
Reading	31	26	24	24	24	393
Spelling	17	23	40	24	40	385

Junior high schools whose courses of study are not a part of a sequential curriculum that includes the elementary grades often do not know the English background of their beginning pupils. They take for granted, of course, that spelling, reading, and a certain amount of literature have been taught, but they are not

at all certain as to where, in the grades, grammar instruction begins or how much is taught. Since such information is of great concern in curriculum instruction, whether or not the elementary grades are involved in the process, the survey form included the questions "Does the introduction to formal grammar begin before your students reach seventh grade?" and "If the answer is 'yes,' what year?" A summary of the responses is presented in Table 12.

TABLE 12

Year Formal Grammar Instruction Begins

			Yes		No		No Response
Before the 7th year			146		13		7
Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	No Response
What year?	3	1	19	40	40	15	35

Treatment of Reading and Grammar

The treatment given two instructional areas, reading and grammar, is of special interest in the light of national curriculum trends. Survey returns reveal three types of reading instruction that are provided. One hundred twelve schools stress developmental reading, 58 teach remedial reading in regular classes, and 32 use the assigned group as the unit for remedial reading. The importance attached to remedial reading is further recognized by the fact that 48 schools provide teachers whose job is solely that of teaching remedial reading.

Perhaps the greatest surprise of the entire survey was the analysis of the approach to grammar on the part of the 166 schools responding. Slightly more than 72 per cent, or 120 English departments, indicated that their sole approach to grammar is the traditional one. In sharp contrast, only nine schools indicated that the linguistic approach is followed exclusively. Twenty-three other schools reported both a traditional and linguistic approach. Fifteen English departments did not lay claim to any standard procedure in grammar instruction.

A further insight into the status of the prevailing approach to grammar instruction was revealed by the written notations of respondents who were not content with merely letting a check mark indicate their complete reactions. Typical explanatory comments were: "some of each," "a little of both," "pilot courses," "two classes," "experimental," and "Teachers are allowed to use as much of the new grammar as they feel confident with."

TABLE 13

Approach to Grammar (Number of Schools)

Traditional Only	Linguistic Only	Traditional and Linguistic	No Standard Procedure
120	9	23	15

Basic Texts

An important key to the nature of a school's curriculum and to the content of individual courses of study in general is that of the text-books used. Not infrequently textbooks and courses of study are synonymous, as was indicated on one survey form whose notation concerning courses of study read, "We follow the text." At the opposite extreme are those schools that do not rely on any one basic text.

The reliance of English departments on basic texts varies greatly among the five English instructional areas. In descending order the prevalence of basic texts as indicated by survey responses was found to be: grammar, 135; spelling, 102; literature, 96; developmental reading, 84; remedial reading, 56; composition, 53; and linguistics, 19. Differing interpretations as to what constitutes a composition text may invalidate that area's figure to some extent. Some respondents listed the same text for both grammar and composition, while others indicated that they had no basic text for composition.

Most schools responded in whole or in part to the request for a listing of the basic texts used in the five areas of English instruction. The results showed a wide range of opinions in regard to textbook selection. This was especially true in the areas of grammar and composition, where twenty different books received mention from one to thirty-one times. The leading grammar texts, listed with the number of mentions each received, were *Building Better English,* 31; *English in Action,* 24; *Warriner's Grammar and Composition,* 23; *Language for Daily Use,* 14; *English for Meaning,* 14; *Our English Language,* 10; and *Enjoying English,* 10. Most schools listing texts in composition indicated that they were the same as those used in grammar.

Spelling book preferences showed a greater unanimity of opinion than did those of grammar. Two books, *Basic Goals in Spelling,* the choice of 41 schools, and *My Word Book,* used by 27, accounted for the choices of 68 of 92 English departments. No other textbook was indicated as a choice by more than four schools.

Anthologies were the most frequently listed types of books in the area of literature. In all, thirty-three different texts were cited, with no book receiving more than nineteen mentions. Those used in from eight to twenty schools, in order of preference, included: *Adventures for Readers, All Around America, Wide Wide World,* and *Journeys into America.*

Anthologies also predominated among the textbook choices for classes in developmental reading. Most of the anthologies were duplications of those listed for literature, and the leading titles were identical for the two areas. In addition, 24 schools reported the use of SRA materials.

Materials used in remedial reading classes were less frequently listed, but SRA materials again predominated. Although no book title appeared many times, several mentioned included *Panoramas, Parades,* the companion series of *Adventures*, the *Reader's Digest Series,* and *Basic Reading Skills.*

Ability Grouping

In an increasing number of schools students are being placed in separate English classes according to ability, or an attempt is made to recognize and deal differently with students of varying abilities within a class. Since placing students into such groups as honors, average, and low requires programs tailored specifically for each group, the character of curriculum planning becomes much more complicated.

Questionnaire responses show that more than two-thirds of the 163 English departments recording themselves on the subject of ability grouping practice some form of it in their instruction. Most of those that follow this form schedule separate ability classes, while a few set up divisions within a class. Table 14 presents a summary of the survey findings regarding this matter.

TABLE 14

Ability Grouping

	Yes	No	No Response
No. of Schools	115	48	3
Kinds			
Separate Groups	Divisions within Classes	Other	No Response
100	8	2	56

Are Courses of Study in Writing?

Increasing concern over the subject matter content of English courses is constantly placing new demands upon curriculum builders. In addition to insistence upon frequent revision and sequential development, instructions to curriculum committees specify that all courses of study *must* be in writing and readily available to all concerned.

Many junior high school department heads find that requests for copies of courses of study are not limited to department members for direct use. They are frequently requested by other schools, both inside and outside the system, to supply course outlines for purposes of comparison and curriculum improvement.

Survey results summarized in Table 15 indicate that a large proportion of the responding schools satisfy modern trends concerning course of study availability.

TABLE 15
Availability of Courses of Study

	Yes	No	No Response
Is it in writing?	88	38	40
Are copies available?	70	28	68

After a course of study has been drawn up, there are at least two distinctly different attitudes that can be taken toward it. A department can insist that each teacher be held strictly to the letter of each required item, or a certain freedom of choice may be permitted in order to make allowances for differing abilities among classes and individuals and to encourage teachers to continually study and improve the curriculum. In response to the question, "Are individual teachers allowed much, some, or little freedom in carrying out the courses of study they teach?" replies from over two-thirds of the 166 schools responding suggested that a great amount of freedom is permitted.

TABLE 16
Freedom of Teachers in Carrying Out Courses of Study

Much	Some	Little	No Response
113	24	3	26

TEACHING PREPARATION AND ASSIGNMENTS

An analysis of the preparation and teaching assignments of the over-all staff of 1114 English teachers in 166 Illinois junior high

schools presents what is perhaps the most revealing and challenging picture of the entire survey. To begin, such an analysis shows that of the entire teaching staff, 438, or only slightly more than 39 per cent, are full-time teachers of English, while over 60 per cent, or 676 teachers, are part-time English department members who also instruct in one or more other subject areas.

TABLE 17
Full and Part-Time English Instruction

No. of Schools	English Staff	Full-Time English	Part-Time English
166	1114	438	676

Social studies leads the list of most commonly taught second subjects by a wide margin. French, mathematics, guidance, science, library, and typing follow as second subjects and duties with far fewer designations. Evidencing a leaning toward elementary school organization, several schools listed as "other subjects taught" reading, spelling, writing (penmanship), and literature. Figures concerning the distribution are presented in Table 18 below.

TABLE 18
Other Subjects Taught by English Teachers
(Subjects and Number of Schools)

Social	Reading	French	Spelling	Math
93	17	12	12	8
Guidance	Science	Library	Typing	Music
8	7	4	3	3

Seven of the subjects enumerated above were checked as being taught in a block of time with English. Again social studies was well in the lead, followed by spelling and reading, as is shown by Table 19.

TABLE 19
Taught in a Block of Time with English
(Subjects and Number of Schools)

So-cial	Spell-ing	Read-ing	Writ-ing	Litera-ture	Science	Mathe-matics
55	26	18	7	5	1	1

Nationwide concern over adequate teacher preparation prompted the survey committee to inquire as to the number of English teachers who have a major in the field. Unfortunately, 28 schools furnished complete information except for indicating the number of English majors; however, figures compiled from the replies of the 138 remaining schools show a 49.23 percentage that corresponds with the national average.

When it was discovered that more than half of the 916 English teachers involved do not teach English exclusively, the committee decided to make a comparison with respect to English majors between the 36 English departments, all of whose teachers teach full time, and the 103 schools having teachers who also instruct in other subject areas. The results are impressive and thought-provoking.

The study revealed that 93, or 61.59 per cent, of the 151 teachers teaching full-time English in 35 schools had a major in the field. In 21 of the schools all of the teachers had majors; only three had none. Most of the departments represented were in the one-to-four-teacher class. Eight had from five to ten teachers.

In the 103 remaining schools there were 253 English teachers teaching full time, as compared with 548 who were teaching other subjects as well. Three hundred fifty-eight majors were reported for a percentage of 44.69. In 51 schools half or more of the teachers were English majors, but only four schools had 100 per cent and ten had none. English departments ranged in size from one to twenty-four members.

TABLE 20
English Teacher Preparation and Teaching Assignments

	Full Time	Part Time	English Majors	% Majors
103 Schools	253	548	358	44.69
35 Schools	151	0	93	61.59
138 Schools	368	548	451	49.23

No doubt the statistics just presented will provoke some thought and discussion. Reasons will be offered for the greater number of English majors in schools whose teachers are all full-time English. Should the question of staff size enter into a discussion, the distribution presented in Table 21 should prove helpful.

TABLE 21
Number of Full-Time English Teachers According to Staff Size

1–4	5–8	9–12	13–16	17–20	21–24
67	47	38	14	0	3

ENGLISH TEACHER LOAD

A much more detailed and scientific study than that of this survey would be required to determine the exact degree to which the junior high schools of Illinois are attempting to establish an "efficient teaching load" for English teachers. The picture is complicated by the fact that in more than half of the schools reporting, some or all English teachers instruct in other subject areas (social studies 56 per cent). Double and triple consecutive period classes resulting from the teaching of combination courses in block-of-time arrangements make it difficult to compare the load of the English teacher who teaches such classes with that of one who teaches nothing but English.

Anticipating these difficulties, the survey committee decided that questions concerning class information should be directed to full-time English teachers only in order that data provided would have greater meaning and could be more easily compared with the results of other studies. To solve still another problem that arose, the committee also decided that, since most schools consider such teaching areas as spelling, reading, writing, and literature a definite part of English instruction, schools that do not so consider them would be counted among the schools having full-time instruction.

Survey questions seeking responses bearing on English teacher load dealt with (1) the number of classes taught each day, (2) class size, (3) the length of class periods, (4) the number of periods classes meet each week, (5) other subjects taught by English teachers, (6) the number of pieces of written work required during given periods, (7) the use of lay readers, (8) the availability of a special teacher whose only duty is that of teaching reading, and (9) special duties performed by English teachers without compensation. In spite of the dual role pictured by the returns for many of the English teachers in more than half of the schools reporting, answers to the questions listed present much conclusive evidence concerning English teacher load in the junior high schools of Illinois.

In terms of class load, the typical Illinois junior high school full-time English teacher is one who teaches five 24-student classes a day for five 45-minute periods a week. Since all figures used in this statement are medians, many an English teacher would protest the description if it were not accompanied by qualifying details.

Four hundred thirty-eight straight English teachers in 115 schools teach from two to seven classes a day. Forty-nine English

departments report a five-class schedule, and twenty-five indicate a six-class teaching day. Several schools with two- and three-class schedules have double and triple consecutive class periods of directly-related subjects with such typical combinations as English, reading, and spelling.

TABLE 22

Number of Classes Taught Per Day

	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
Number of Schools	5	18	12	49	25	6	115

Class Sizes

The total number of students that English teachers face each day varies greatly among schools and, to a degree, within some departments. At one extreme teachers of four schools meet from 24 to 56 students daily, and at the other end of the scale six schools report class loads of from 196 to 220 students. The median class load is approximately 122 students, well past the suggested 100 figure that should entitle a teacher to some kind of relief such as is provided by lay readers and clerical assistance.

National figures indicate that class sizes are greater by approximately one-third in the larger systems. No such specific or uniform pattern is apparent in the junior high schools of Illinois. If schools had been asked to account for their large or small class enrollments, they would undoubtedly have listed such reasons as (1) the local economic situation, (2) administrative recognition or non-recognition of the English teacher's comparative work load, and (3) various organizational systems such as ability grouping and blocks of time that cause variations in the sizes of individual classes.

In schools whose junior high school organization leans in the direction of the elementary school, the total class load is cut down appreciably by combining classes of English with those of reading, writing, spelling, and literature. The same, of course, is true for English teachers who teach core or combination courses that correlate English with the social studies.

TABLE 23

Number of Students Taught Each Day

	24–56	57–78	79–95	100–122	123–150	155–180	196–220
No. of Schools	4	10	21	25	38	15	6

Length of Class Periods

In 1956 William T. Gruhn and Harl B. Douglass, reporting in their study and survey summary, *The Modern Junior High School,* pointed out a distinct trend toward longer class periods. The typical daily junior high school schedule at that time called for six periods, each fifty to fifty-five minutes in length. Present survey results indicate that the typical Illinois junior high school has shorter class periods than were prevalent throughout the nation in 1956, and that it does not appear to be following the predicted national trend.

IATE survey results reveal a 47-minute median almost identical with that reported by the Illinois Junior High School Principal's Association in 1961. Forty-seven per cent, or 55 of 117 schools with full-time English teachers, have even shorter class periods of between 40 and 45 minutes in length. Eighteen schools having class periods more than an hour in length (80 to 180 minutes) frequently label the period a language-arts period, in some cases suggesting that it is actually two or three consecutive class periods of instruction in English in combination with one or more closely related areas: writing, literature, spelling, and reading.

TABLE 24

Length of Class Periods

	30	40–45	46–50	51–60	65	80	83–90	135–180	Total
No. of Schools	1	55	25	18	1	7	8	2	117

Number of Class Periods a Week

The class-load factor having the greatest degree of uniformity is that concerning the number of times classes meet each week. In the English departments of eighty-seven schools, or approximately three-fourths of the 118 departments that have from one to all of their English teachers teaching full time, classes meet five periods a week. Most of the schools whose number of class periods vary from seven to twelve a week accompanied their responses with explanations suggesting Language Arts periods the length of two class periods, double period classes, and block-of-time combinations for instruction in the related areas of English, literature, grammar, and spelling. In many such cases, as previously reported, teachers teach two or three classes, meeting fewer students each day, but for longer periods.

TABLE 25

Number of Class Periods Per Week

	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	12	Totals
No. of Schools	2	87	7	2	2	7	10	1	118

Amount of Theme Work

One of the few survey questions receiving almost a 100 per cent response was that concerning the amount and frequency of student writing, "Is it generally agreed among your staff that a specific number of pieces of written work is to be required each week or month? If so, how many per week, month, or other (unit of time)?" Sixty-four per cent of the replies answered the first part in the negative. This response falls only ten per cent short of that received in the famous Dusel California survey that inspired many national studies of English teacher loads. Concerning the California findings, the Dusel report declared, "These teachers have been free to assign as much or as little writing as they wish. As pupil-class loads and extra-curricular duties have become heavier, composition assignments have become less frequent."

In the present study fifty-seven English departments, representing only 35 per cent of the schools responding, went on to answer the follow-up question quoted above. Thirty-seven of them indicated that a theme a week is required, seventeen have their students write every other week, and the other four divided their responses equally between three and four week periods.

Personal comments accompanying reactions are both interesting and important, especially if they tend to modify a statement of general policy. Accompanying three theme-a-week checks were the statements: "supposedly a theme a week," "if possible," and "we try." Typical of the comments that reinforced the negative answers to the inquiry concerning a definite theme requirement were "determined by individual teachers" and "we do what we are able to do—which is, we all realize, not sufficient."

Remedial Reading Teacher

One of the many duties of a junior high school English teacher is that of teaching reading. In the elementary school, and in seventeen junior high schools participating in this survey, reading is a related but separate study.

Since many teachers of English have never had special courses in reading instruction, many systems are employing reading special-

ists to assist in the organization of developmental-reading courses and to motivate in-service training programs at all grade levels. In an increasing number of cases, individual schools are hiring remedial reading teachers, who are in some cases a part of the English department, to do full or part-time teaching.

To determine the extent to which remedial reading teachers are available in the junior high school area, a survey question asked for a response concerning the employment of a teacher whose duty is solely that of a remedial-reading teacher. Forty-six departments reported that their schools have such a teacher. Seventy-one per cent, or 114 schools, indicated that they do not.

TABLE 26

Full-time Remedial Reading Teacher

Yes	No	No Response
46	114	6

Lay Readers

Communication in the High School Curriculum, Illinois Curriculum Bulletin D-2, sets forth for the benefit of school administrators two guiding principles concerning the load of the English teacher whose paper-grading responsibilities are usually heavier than those of any other teacher.

1. When a teacher has more than 100 students, he should have assistance (lay reader and clerical assistance).
2. A lay reader should be provided for every two English teachers having a full load (more than 100 pupils per teacher).

If the principles set forth above were to become law, many junior high school English teachers would automatically become eligible for the relief that lay readers could provide. The situation warranting such relief has existed for some time. English teachers and other concerned people have discussed it, written about it, have proposed remedies for it. And with what result?

Survey returns from 154 junior high school English departments furnish conclusive proof that the result has been quite negative, for only ten of the 154 schools responding indicated that lay readers are used in connection with written composition. Commenting on the degree of success of the lay reader arrangement, three of the ten schools added that the program is very successful,

five declared it to be somewhat successful, and two failed to make an evaluation.

Another Factor in Teacher Load

In each of at least 77 of the 166 junior high schools studied in this survey, teachers from one to all members of the English department are required to perform special duties without compensation in either time or salary. Duties enumerated varied from the common variety, such as hall duty, which all teachers can and often do perform, to those of the more specialized types, like sponsoring a newspaper, that are best performed by teachers trained in the specific area involved. It is the latter with which the survey committee was primarily concerned, because it is such duties that add most heavily to the load of the English teacher whose paper work often surpasses that of any other teacher.

Table 27 below spotlights the fact that the duties most frequently required are those that are extremely demanding upon the English teacher's time and energy—the school newspaper, dramatics, and the yearbook in just that order.

TABLE 27

Special Duties—No Compensation

News-paper	Dra-matics	Year-book	Speech Contests	Library	Clubs	Student Council
55	42	24	13	12	15	16

Numerous studies of teacher loads have established the principle that extra responsibility should be equitably assigned and that released time should be provided when duties are extremely demanding on time and energy. Indications are that this principle is being violated in many a junior high school in Illinois, for what task to which a teacher can be assigned is equal to that of publishing a newspaper, producing a yearbook, or taking charge of dramatic productions? As for the released time recommended, survey figures show that in 77 instances special duties are performed during school hours (in addition to a full load of teaching), and that in 71 cases they are performed after school hours, which may be interpreted to mean not only after the last period class but also in the evening, and on occasion even on week-ends.

Several questionnaires, as if in protest, made specific mention of the fact that English department members who combined ath-

letic coaching with their teaching duties received a money differential as compensation. In like spirit, five junior high schools in a rather large school system (city population 130,000) emphasized the contrast between compensated and non-compensated sponsors of newspapers, dramatics, yearbooks, and debate by pointing out the fact that each of the sponsors receives a differential of $175 a year for his work. A time differential in the form of a publications period that takes the place of one class is an additional reward given to the sponsors of the newspaper and the yearbook.

A CHALLENGE: FOLLOW-UP

You have now had presented to you an objective word picture analyzing various phases of the work and organization of the English departments in 166 of the 345 junior high schools in Illinois. You have had the opportunity of comparing your personal teaching situation and that of your school and school system with those existing in all parts of the state. What are your reactions?

The first and decidedly positive reaction of many of you has already been expressed in answer to the final query of the survey form. With only four dissenting voices 142 respondents gave affirmative response to the question, "Would you like to see the Special Projects Committee undertake further research?" Answers were accompanied by suggested major interest areas, a listing of which, together with the number of times each was mentioned, included: composition, 62; grammar (including linguistics, 21, and usage, 2), 59; reading instruction, 19; literature, 17; spelling and vocabulary, 7; and the sequential curriculum, 5.

With the ink barely dry on the present survey report, there is little likelihood of immediate further research. The major purpose of a survey is follow-up in the light of its findings. Solutions should be sought for long-standing problems that are of deep concern to individual teachers, departments, schools, school systems, and groups of teachers such as IATE and the NCTE. Unless they are, this IATE study, like the scores of articles, addresses, studies, and reports that have urged action concerning many of the problems dealt with in this survey, will have been conducted in vain.

As stated in the prologue to the survey form, the purposes of the study were those of re-appraising teaching programs and organizational details through a comparison with those of other schools with an eye to the improvement of English instruction and the conditions of teaching. The basic problems about which inquiry was made are presented here as a challenging check-list that should

provoke thought and discussion both individually and collectively on the part of serious-minded English teachers throughout the state.

Check List

1. What is the best form of junior high school in terms of years included?
2. Do you have a definite department organization?
3. Do you have a paid or time-compensated department leader?
4. Just how sequential is your English curriculum, elementary through senior high school?
5. Do you need greater balance among the five major areas of English instruction?
6. Is composition a neglected area in English instruction?
7. Is reading given adequate attention?
8. Is each course of study definitely planned and in writing?
9. Are you open-minded in your study of the possibilities of the new grammars?
10. Have you studied the affects of the combination courses on English instruction, especially in regard to the preparedness of teachers to teach English?
11. Are your class loads so heavy that they are making adequate instruction in English difficult?
12. Why not hire lay readers?
13. To what extent do extra duties for English teachers make it difficult to do justice to the English program?
14. How many of the teachers teaching English in your school are English majors?
15. How effective is ability grouping?
16. To what extent do you place reliance on basic texts in your courses of study?
17. Did your school reply to the questionnaire? Will it next time?

Like the English curriculum, the attack upon the problems enumerated can be sequential. Many needed improvements in procedures and course content are possible on the part of the individual classroom teacher. Some require the cooperation of the department or of the department with the principal or superintendent. Others can be achieved by inter-school cooperation, elementary-junior high school-senior high school. All require study until informed champions of a just cause, armed with all the facts,

can present the case intelligently to whatever "jury" is capable of rendering a "verdict."

When the survey questionnaire was being prepared, much use was made of "A Check List for Evaluating the English Program in the Junior and Senior High School" prepared by the Commission on the Curriculum of the National Council of Teachers of English. The complete checklist is incorporated in Bulletin D-2, *Communication in the High School Curriculum* published by the State Department of Public Instruction. Reprints of the check-list may be obtained from NCTE headquarters, 508 South Sixth Street, Champaign, for 15 cents each, or $1.50 for packets of thirty copies. The check-list will be found to be very helpful in studies concerning every phase of English instruction.

A final word is inspired by two experiences growing out of conducting the survey: (1) During the course of a platform announcement pertaining to the distribution of questionnaires at the 1964 IATE Conference, a show of hands revealed an attendance of only 35 junior high school representatives. (2) Several personal postscript questions asked on the survey sheets inquired as to how one would go about obtaining copies of the *Illinois English Bulletin* and of this survey report which, it was announced, would be in a future issue of the *Bulletin*. Both of these experiences bespeak the need for (1) a greater effort on the part of the IATE to contact every English teacher in the state during its annual membership drive, and (2) greater professional interest and concern on the part of every English teacher in Illinois for an organization that, with the cooperation of an active membership, can do much toward solving the problems that confront English teachers everywhere.

In appointing a committee to conduct this survey, IATE representatives referred to the junior high school as the area most neglected by the Association in the past. This survey is only the beginning of a greater recognition of the junior high school and its problems by the state Association.